

**Remarks**

The Office Action dated June 18, 2010, has been carefully considered. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13 to include the heat exchanger and temperature of same as disclosed in paragraph [0059] of the current application. In light of these amendments and the below remarks, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the current claims.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

In Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, and 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henriquez (US 4,840,737) in view of Bastiaensen et al. (WO 00/01657, as translated by US 6,541,665), Meisenburg et al. (US 3,801,285) and Kahmann et al. (US 2,770,533) or, alternatively, Bastiaensen et al. (WO 00/01657, as translated by US 6,541,665) in view of Henriquez (US 4,840,737), Meisenburg et al. (US 3,801,285) and Kahmann et al. (US 2,770,533). Applicants have amended claims 1 and 13, on which the remaining claims depend, to include the heat exchanger and temperature of same.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose all the elements of the current invention as required under MPEP § 706. Specifically, the cited references do not teach, suggest, or disclose (1) the use of a heat exchanger and the temperature of such heat exchanger, (2) the pressure limitations of a first region (“not less than about 0.5 bar”), or (3) the pressure limitations of a second region (“may reach a pressure from about 0.1 to about 30 bar”). The MPEP requires that all claim limitations be considered in rejecting a patent under section 103. MPEP § 2143.03. This is a requirement for a prima facie rejection. See MPEP § 2143. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited

references, alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or disclose the new limitation or the previously presented limitations. Additionally, the Office Action makes no attempt to articulate why or how the previously presented limitations were taught, suggested, or disclosed in the cited references. MPEP § 706. As such, Applicants respectfully request the examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-9, 11 and 13-23.

***Conclusion***

In light of the foregoing remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' counsel at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip P. McCann/

Philip P. McCann  
Registration No. 30,919  
SMITH MOORE LEATHERWOOD LLP  
P.O. Box 21927  
Greensboro, NC 27420  
(336) 378-5302  
phil.mccann@smithmoorelaw.com

Date: July 30, 2010

File No. 5003073.060US1

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING  
TRANSMITTED VIA EFS-WEB TO THE UNITED STATES  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE ADDRESSED TO:  
MAIL STOP AF, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS,  
P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450, ON  
July 30, 2010  
(Date)

Mary M. Garner  
Name of Depositor

/Mary M. Garner/  
Signature

July 30, 2010  
Date of Signature